DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 044 052 FL 001 620

AUTHOR Levenston, E. A.
TITLE The "Translation-Paradigm": A Technique for Contrastive Syntax.
PUB DATE Aug 65
NOTE 5p.
JOURNAL CIT International Review of Applied Linguistics; v3 n3 p221-225 Aug 1965

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.35
DESCRIPTORS *Contrastive Linguistics, English, *Form Classes (Languages), Grammar, Hebrew, Linguistic Patterns, Modern Languages, Phrase Structure, Semitic Languages, *Structural Grammar, *Structural Linguistics, Synchronic Linguistics, *Syntax

ABSTRACT

Syntactic differences between languages are the focus of attention in this approach to contrastive study of grammatical categories. The categories of the first language are listed in a "translation-paradigm" opposite the possible categories of the target language after translation of the corpus. Three examples which contrast the clause, verbal group, and the word in English and Israeli Hebrew grammar are developed following M. A. K. Halliday's "categories of the theory of grammar." (RL)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

THE "TRANSLATION–PARADIGM"
A TECHNIQUE FOR CONTRASTIVE SYNTAX

by E. A. Levenston, Jerusalem

ED044052

From: IRAL Volume III, Number 3, (1965)

FL 001 620

L'analyse syntaxique comparée de deux langues peut être présentée sous la forme de "paradigmes de traduction" faisant figurer une catégorie grammaticale d'une langue A en face de toutes ses traductions possibles en termes de catégories grammaticales d'une deuxième langue B.

Des notes ajoutées au paradigme peuvent spécifier les différents critères gouvernant le choix de l'une ou l'autre des catégories équivalentes pour un tel paradigme.

Une présentation de ce genre exige une description complète des deux langues en présence. L'auteur donne de nombreux exemples empruntés à l'anglais et à l'hébreu moderne, utilisant la théorie des catégories grammaticales de Halliday. L'auteur poursuit actuellement l'analyse de transcriptions faites d'après des conversations en hébreu et de leurs traductions en anglais – les exemples fournis dans le présent article dérivent de ce matériel.

Les "paradigmes de traduction" peuvent aider le professeur de langues à identifier, chez un étudiant, la source d'une erreur due à l'influence de sa langue maternelle. L'ensemble de ces paradigmes forme une sorte de dictionnaire bilingue, opposant les catégories grammaticales des deux langues, et non les mots par lesquels elles s'actualisent.

Die vergleichende syntaktische Analyse zweier Sprachen kann in der Form von "Übersetzungsparadigmen" dargestellt werden. Diese Paradigmen stellen eine grammatische Kategorie der Sprache A mit Hilfe aller möglichen Übersetzungen in die entsprechenden Kategorien der 2. Sprache dar.

Dem Paradigma beigefügte Anmerkungen können die verschiedenen Kriterien spezifizieren, die die Wahl der einen oder anderen für ein solches Paradigma equivalenten Kategorie bestimmen.

Eine Darstellung dieser Art führt zu einer vollständigen Beschreibung der zwei behandelten Sprachen. Vf. gibt zahlreiche Beispiele aus dem Englischen und dem modernen Hebräisch, wobei er Hallidays Theorie der grammatischen Kategorien benutzt. Diese Beispiele beruhen auf der Analyse von Transkriptionen hebräischer Konversation und deren Übersetzung ins Englische.

Die "Übersetzungsparadigmen" können dem Sprachlehrer dazu verhelfen, beim Schüler die im muttersprachlichen Einfluß begründete Fehlerquelle zu identifizieren.

Die Gesamtheit dieser Paradigmen bildet eine Art zweisprachiges Wörterbuch, das die grammatischen Kategorien der beiden Sprachen einander gegenüberstellt, nicht aber die Wörter, durch welche diese ausgedrückt werden.

One way of presenting the syntactic differences between languages is what may be called a "translation-paradigm". A grammatical category from language

A is listed opposite all the categories in language B by which it may be translated. Whenever possible, the grammatical and contextual criteria governing the choice of one translation rather than another are listed in notes to the paradigm. The most frequent translation is listed first; where it is the unmarked equivalent, always chosen unless there are specific grammatical and/or contextual criteria dictating an alternative choice, no notes need be appended.

The following three examples are taken from three different units—clause, group, and word—required for the description of both English and Israeli Hebrew grammar in terms of the "categories of the theory of grammar" described by M.A.K. Halliday in his article of that name [1]). They presuppose a fairly complete description of Israeli Hebrew and English grammar in terms of Halliday's theory. The grammatical terminology in the examples as here presented has been kept as close as possible to traditional usage in order that it may be understood without reference to the grammars; the examples given at the end of each note should prevent misunderstanding. The precise use of each term, however, is rigorously defined in the grammars, which are an indispensable prerequisite for this form of presentation of contrastive syntax; the examples can then be dispensed with.

Example 1 – The Clause – dependent or independent.

English	*Hebrew*	
Transitive clause, with "be" as predicator, and a nominal group complement	Nominal clause	(a)
	Transitive clause, with "hayah" as predicator	(b)
	Intransitive clause	(c)
	Transitive clause, with other verbs as predicator, and object marked by bə- etc.	(d)

(a) When the English verbal group is non-modal, present tense, and the subject is *not* unstressed "there". I am old = 'aniy zaḳen

(b) when the English verbal group is modal ("can", "will", etc.) or *past* tense, and the subject is *not* unstressed "there". I was old = ('aniy) hayiytiy zaḳen.

(c) i) when the English subject is unstressed "there", in which case if the verbal group is as in (a) above, the Hebrew predicator is non-verbal ("yeš", "'eyn" etc.) and if the verbal group is as in (b) above, the Hebrew predicator will be "hayah".
There are some who ... = yeš ka'eleh še ...
There were some who ... = hayuw ka'eleh še ...

ii) frequently when English has an adjectival complement, Hebrew has a single verb, especially when describing attitudes of mind e.g. I was right = ṣadaḳtiy, I was excited = hitragaštiy

---

[1]) In *Word, XVII* (December, 1961), 241–292.

(d) as in (c) ii), when the English adjective is followed by a prepositional phrase e.g. I was interested in him = hit' anyantiy bow, he was proud of it = hitga'ah bow.

Example 2 – The Verbal Group

English	*Hebrew*	
Past Perfect	Past Simple	
	Past Simple & k̲bar	(a)
	Compound Past	(b)

(a) in dependent and independent clauses. "k̲bar" is added whenever the prior nature of the action of one verb with respect to another verb is either not clear from the context, or requires stressing.
When I arrived, he had gone = kšehiga'tiy, k̲bar halak̲.

(b) in dependent conditional clauses where the conjunction equivalence is "if" = "'im".
If he had come, ... ='im hayah ba', ...

Example 3 – The Possessive Adjective ("my" etc.)

English	*Hebrew*	
A nominal group, "my ~", where ~ is any noun	A noun with pronominal suffix	
	A determined noun followed by "sěliy" etc.	(a)
	A determined noun	(b)

(a) Noun with pronominal suffix is here taken to be the unmarked form. My ball = kaduwriy. Factors in Hebrew grammar affecting the choice between "kaduwriy" and "hakaduwr šeliy" as equivalents of "my ball" are discussed in full in the appropriate section of the Hebrew grammar.

(b) in clause structures where the pronominal reference may be contained in some other element of clause structure in Hebrew, and the noun is one of a lexical set referring mainly to parts of the body but including also clothes, close relatives, and "pocket". (The clause structures in question can be precisely specified, but this is overcomplicated for present purposes.)
The cold goes through to *your* bones
haḳowr ḥoder *lə̲ka la'aṣamowt*
We had to take off *our* vests
hayi*nuw* ṣriyk̲iym ləhowriyd 'et *baguwpiyowt*

These three examples have been chosen to illustrate as wide a variety as possible of the kind of notes that may be appended. They may contain

i) formal (grammatical) criteria governing choice of translation – Paradigm 2 note (b)

ii) contextual criteria – Paradigm 2 note (a)

iii) a combination of formal (grammatical) and contextual criteria – Paradigm 1 Note (c) ii). Paradigm 3, especially note (b), is an example of a common phenomenon in language comparison, what may be called cross-rank equivalence. There is no discrete equivalent at Hebrew *word* rank for an English *word,* and the translation is, as it were, spread across the Hebrew clause.

Sometimes it is impossible to state any grammatical or contextual reasons why a particular structure is used as translation for certain lexical items. In that case, some of the lexical items must be quoted as examples in the notes, without generalization. This is shown by part of the translation paradigm for English nominal groups containing a noun and an adjective:

Example 4 – Attributive Adjectives

English	*Hebrew*	
Nominal Group, adjective & noun	Noun & adjective	
	Construct noun & Absolute noun (determined or non-determined)	(a)
	Noun & prepositional phrase	(b)
	etc.	

(a) e.g. public opinion = da ʿat haḳahal,
rainy days = yəmey gešem.

(b) e.g. pregnant woman = našiym bəherayown

All the equivalences shown in English-Hebrew paradigms are one-way, and not necessarily reversible. It is often useful for teaching purposes to give also the Hebrew-English paradigm, especially when an English structure has only one Hebrew equivalent, but the converse does not hold. An example is the English clause where a verb is followed by another verb in the infinitive with "to": –

Example 5 – Phase Intransitive Clauses

English		*Hebrew*
Clause with verb & to & infinitive	⟶	Clause with verb & infinitive

BUT

Example 5 A Phase Intransitive Clauses

Hebrew	*English*	
Clause with verb & infinitive	verb & to & infinitive	
	verb & "-ing" form	(a)
	verb & preposition & "-ing" form	(b)
	verb & how & to & infinitive	(c)
	verb & adverbial phrase	(d)

(a) e. g. he started working = hiṯḥiyl la'aḇowd
(b) e. g. he succeeded in leaving = hiṣliyaḥ laṣe't
(c) e. g. he knew how to play = yada' lə śaḥeḳ
(d) e. g. he ran a lot = hirbah laruwṣ

The statement of contrastive syntax in this form may be derived from either
(a) a bilingual's use of himself as his own informant for both languages, or
(b) close comparison of a specific text with its translation.

The first alternative may appear more comprehensive, but it cannot guarantee to cover all possibilities, and cannot give any information as to frequency of occurrence. The second method has the advantage that the validity of every term in the paradigm can be fully established, with details of frequency of occurrence, *for the text under consideration.* All the examples quoted are from work in progress, using as text transcriptions of recorded Hebrew conversation and their translation into English. Note, however, that the Hebrew translation-paradigms have been given for particular categories in English; once the texts are available for study it is irrelevant which was originally target and which was source.

The forms here given, mainly English→Hebrew, are those which throw most light on the probable difficulties of the Israeli learning to use those English categories. In fact, the translation-paradigm can assist the teacher to identify the source of an error produced by transference of a pattern from the mother tongue. If he can guess from the context what structure the learner *ought* to have chosen, reference to the English-Hebrew translation-paradigm for the *correct* English structure will probably show which Hebrew structure influenced the choice of the *wrong* English form.

A complete set of translation-paradigms, from sentence to morpheme, at different degrees of delicacy, should do for the grammars of two languages what a bilingual dictionary does for the vocabularies. The essential difference is that it compares grammatical categories and not the words by which they are realized. This, it is suggested, is the form which Fries's "systematic comparison of these two descriptive analyses" [of the language of the learner and the language to be learnt] [2]) should take. But the uses to which it may be put, whether for prediction of difficulties, or "as a basis for the selection, presentation and ordering of the materials in a meaningful sequence" [3]), are a matter for pedagogues, not linguists.

The Hebrew University, Jerusalem

---

[2]) C. C. Fries, "American Linguistics and the Teaching of English," *Language Learning,* VII (1955), 11.
[3]) Sol Saporta. "Problems in the comparison of the morphemic systems of English and Spanish," *Hispania, XXXIX* (1956), 36–40.

© "PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Julius Groos Verlag
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."